

REMARKS

Reconsideration and continued examination of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 are remain pending, wherein claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 have been amended.

Initially, Applicants would like to thank Examiner Yenke for his time and courtesy during the personal interview conducted with the undersigned on September 2, 2005.

Claims 1-7 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of alleged Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), U.S. Patent No. 6,084,643 to Kishtaka et al. ("Kishtaka") and U.S. Patent No. 6,249,320 to Schneidewend et al. ("Schneidewend"). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of AAPA, Kishtaka and Schneidewend does not render Applicants' claim 1 unpatentable because the combination does not disclose or suggest a channel selection device comprising "an on-screen display output circuit, which provides a matrix display of channel information, wherein different main channels are listed across rows of the matrix and sub-channels are listed in a same column of the matrix as a corresponding main channel" as recited in Applicants' claim 1. Additionally, the combination does not disclose or suggest an input device that "has UP/DOWN keys and RIGHT/LEFT keys for giving a channel changing instruction, key pairs of which are assigned for main channel switch-over and sub-channel switch-over respectively" as also recited in Applicants' claim 1.

The Office Action relies upon Figure 5 of the present application for the disclosure of an on-screen display which displays main channels and sub-channels of received broadcasts. As discussed on page 2 of the present application, Figure 5 illustrates a configuration of sub-channels in a time band that have the same main channel. However, as discussed during the personal interview, Figure 5 does not disclose or suggest having *different main channels listed across rows of a matrix and sub-channels listed in a same corresponding main channel* as recited in Applicants' claim 1. Additionally, AAPA does not disclose or suggest key pairs "which are assigned for main channel switch-over and sub-channel switch-over respectively" as also recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Kishtaka discloses satellite receiving equipment as well as a remote commander. However, Kishtaka does not disclose or suggest the on-screen display output circuit or the input device with the key pair assignment recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Schneidewend discloses a video processing system that outputs an electronic program guide. (Figures 12 and 13). The electronic program guide of Figure 12 lists different main channels in the same column and sub-channels corresponding to a main channel are listed in a column adjacent to the main channel column. The electronic program guide of Figure 13 does not list subchannels. Accordingly, Schneidewend does not disclose or suggest a "a matrix display of channel information, wherein different main channels are listed across rows of the matrix and sub-channels are listed in a same column of the matrix as a corresponding main channel" as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Additionally, the Schneidewend does not disclose or suggest the input device with the key pair assignment recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Because AAPA, Kishtaka and Schneidewend each do not disclose or suggest the on-screen display output circuit or the input device with the particular key pair assignments recited in Applicants' claim 1, the combination cannot render Applicants' claim 1 unpatentable.

Claim 2 has been amended to recite an on-screen display output circuit that provides a matrix display of channel information as recited in Applicants' claim 1. Additionally, claim 2 also recites an input device with the same key pair assignment as that discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over the combination of AAPA, Kishtaka and Schneidewend for similar reasons to those discussed above with regard to Applicants' claim 1.

Claim 6 recites a method with similar elements to those discussed above with regard to claim 1, and accordingly, is patentably distinguishable over the combination of AAPA, Kishtaka and Schneidewend for similar reasons to those discussed above with regard to Applicants' claim 1.

Claims 3-5 variously depend from claim 2, and claim 7 depends from claim 6. Accordingly, these claims are patentably distinguishable over the combination of AAPA, Kishtaka and Schneidewend for at least those reasons stated above with regard to their respective independent claims.

For at least those reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-7 as allegedly being obvious in view of the combination of AAPA, Kishtaka and Schneidewend be withdrawn.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 010482.50862US).

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey D. Sanok
Registration No. 32,169
Stephen W. Palan
Registration No. 43,420

September 16, 2005

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
SWP:vlc
#395977